

Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 4

Article 47

5-1-1933

Buchmanism

Theo. Graebner

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Graebner, Theo. (1933) "Buchmanism," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 4 , Article 47.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol4/iss1/47>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

В. 24. 25. Das Wort $\eta\beta\eta\eta$ heißt eigentlich kreisen, mit Schmerzen gebären; darum hat es auch die genaue griechische Übersetzung des Aquila mit $\omega\delta\iota\eta\theta\eta\eta$ wiedergegeben; dann heißt es überhaupt gebären, hervorbringen, und die LXX übersetzen es mit $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\alpha\upsilon$. Alle Ausagen in В. 24—26 weisen hin auf die Werke des Anfangs und des ersten Schöpfungstags und betonen aufs stärkste und in immer neuen Ausagen das Sein der Weisheit vor allen Schöpfungswerken und damit ihre Ewigkeit.

2. Fürbringer.

Buchmanism.

Why should a movement that in many respects does not differ from the revivalism of the eighties and earlier decades cause as much commotion as the activities of the Oxford Group, or Buchmanism? What is its message? What are its practises? What, if any, are its merits?

This article contemplates no detailed historical analysis of the movement, but would treat it as of 1933, reserving a more complete discussion for a later issue, if it shall be deemed necessary.

Dr. F. N. D. Buchman is a regularly ordained Lutheran clergyman, a member of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, U. L. C. A writer in the *Lutheran* of January 26, 1933, says: "The call to his first parish and his letter of acceptance happened to pass through our hands, as secretary of the Conference Mission Committee, when it was decided to establish the Church of the Good Shepherd in Overbrook, Philadelphia. He replied to the call, 'Yes, if it be God's will.' For what it is worth, we remark that he was not very successful as a missionary. He undertook to combine what we Lutherans call Inner and Home Missions. It was not a workable combination in Overbrook. Pastor Buchman was then called to the Lutheran Hospice; but in 1907 he severed his connection with that institution, disagreements having arisen between him and its Board of Directors. In 1909 he came to State College, Pennsylvania, as Y. M. C. A. secretary. The interval between 1907 and 1909 was partly spent in Europe, where he made contact with the Keswick Movement in England. One suspects that the convention of these Keswickians gave definiteness to his distinctive interpretation of Christianity. Russell¹⁾ pictures Dr. Buchman as being primarily an individualist, the sort of individualist that is endowed with a gift for organization and administration. He certainly was uncomfortable under the rules and regulations of church authorities. He is a member of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania and punctiliously sends an excuse annually for being absent from the synod's conventions."

1) A. J. Russell, *For Sinners Only*. Harper.

During the fall and winter months of 1932—1933 a large party of exponents of this movement, headed by Dr. Buchman himself, made a tour of Canada and the United States. The first party of thirty-two members—men and women—came to Montreal on October 23. Later eighteen other members arrived from Oxford, under the direction of the Canon of Liverpool, Dr. L. W. Grensted, professor of philosophy in Oriel College, Oxford. The list of adherents includes notable persons from Scotland and London, Baroness Lilian Van Heeckeren of Holland, Mme. Lidi de Trey of Switzerland, Vice-Admiral Sidney Drury-Lowe of the British Navy. Among the notables from our own land are Hon. Carl Vrooman, a Cabinet secretary under President Wilson; Dr. Philip Marshall Brown, professor of international law at Princeton University. They were officially welcomed by the Prime Minister of Ontario, and their public meetings were attended by thousands of people. The meetings are generally conducted in the parlors of the best hotels. At Montreal they met in the Ritz Carlton; in Chicago, at the Drake; in Philadelphia, at the Bellevue Hotel; and in New York, at the new Waldorf. Prominent clergymen of all denominations have entered into its fellowship and call it the opening wedge of a great revival. Its growth in South Africa, in the English universities, in the cities of Scotland, in Holland, Germany, and elsewhere, has been hailed as "one of the most gratifying manifestations of the working of God in these times of need." It is reported that about a thousand groups have been formed to date.

The movement calls itself the First Century Christian Fellowship. That it exercises a profound appeal cannot be denied. It is hailed as a movement to put life into our ecclesiastical organizations, to convert the churches. As Mr. Vrooman said at Chicago: "It is the most vital and hopeful religious movement of our generation. It is the only movement discernible to-day that seems capable of giving our generation that spiritual awakening which alone can save civilization." The *Canadian Churchman*, official organ of the Anglican Church in Canada, has given it unqualified support. The editor writes: "It would be a godsend to countless homes if the Oxford Group's message reached them. . . . Here lies the hope of our puzzled world. . . . If the apostles turned the world upside down in the first century, this message of the Group is dynamic enough to do it again in the twentieth century. . . . We urge all parsons and laity alike to get in touch with the Group." A correspondent of the *Presbyterian* (Philadelphia): "This Buchman movement is doing for the upper strata of life what Commander Booth did for the lower strata of life and his Salvation Army is still doing." The *Family Herald and Weekly Star*, the most widely circulated family magazine in Canada, devoted nearly two pages to letters of prominent Canadian

clergymen who are endorsing the movement. In a leading editorial this journal asks the question: "Is Canada to take part in what seems to be one of the greatest religious movements of all time — a movement comparable with, and perhaps outrivaling, those of imperishable influence, for which Luther, Wesley, Augustine, and Booth are responsible? Are we to see here and elsewhere a revival of first-century Christianity, giving purpose and direction to purposeless and misguided lives, setting aloft a fiery cross in every office, every farmhouse, workshop, and institution, and really starting the Christian millennium of the twentieth century?" Though speaking with some caution, the reviewer in the *Lutheran* approves of certain features. "That the Oxford Movement has gotten a hold on thousands in a class admired for culture and often notoriously indifferent to practical Christianity is a fact convincingly in its favor." The dangers are too evident to be blinked at: "The 'mysticism' emphasized, while not without a legitimate sphere of action in Christian life, has within it the possibilities of exaggeration, occultism, and even fanaticism that have characterized 'illumination and direct guidance' in the past when they obtained a hold in minds more responsive to emotion than to calm reasoning. The moment the First Century Christian Fellowship finds the twentieth-century Christianity unfit for the Lord's use and demanding a new sect, it will have ceased to be productive of good and become an agency of enthusiasm creative of heresies." Nevertheless the writer holds "that Dr. Buchman's groups have a message and that he has a mission."

The movement has no organization, no officers, no members, and no official title. By its adherents it is commonly known as "The Groups," "The Oxford Group," or "The Fellowship." Victor Starbuck, writing a defense of the Fellowship in the *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, May, 1932, states the main features, the doctrines and ideas emphasized, as an "entire surrender to God; the daily quiet time of Bible-study, prayer, and meditation; the guidance of the Holy Spirit; the confession of sin; the duty of bearing witness to our own experience of the saving power of Christ; and team-work." The adherents stoutly maintain that they are not a new denomination. They disclaim all intention of displacing, supplanting, or disparaging the organized church. "The Group is merely an aggregation of individual Christians with one great common purpose in life — to witness for Jesus." The Group takes the organized church for granted and therefore does not hold public preaching services, does not administer the Sacraments, does not exact acceptance of creeds. The members of the Group remain members of their own churches and answer to them, and not to the Group, for their confessional position. They are simply workers seeking "to apply in their own lives the teachings of the New Testament."

The absence of any doctrinal emphasis is marked. No creed has been formulated. Mr. Starbuck says: "Most of us are Episcopalians, Methodists, and Presbyterians, with a few Baptists and Congregationalists. Our adherents also include one Catholic, one Christian Scientist, and one Quaker."

At Toronto the reporter of the *Winnipeg Free Press* asked one of the party, Mr. Reggie Holme of New College, Oxford: "Does the Oxford Group believe in the immaculate conception, the crucifixion, and the resurrection of Christ?" "What do you find?" asked Mr. Holme. "We would just leave it to your own self and what guidance Christ gave you."

The movement does not have a form of worship. There is a method for conducting testimony and house-party gatherings. It does not administer the Sacraments, but advises its members to attend their churches. It has no corporate organization enabling it to take title to property, receive endowments, and so forth. It does not set up a budget, appeal for regular contributions, and report receipts and expenditures. There are probably expenses, but these are taken care of by voluntary contributions. The *Lutheran* remarks that some of these "must be fairly liberal: one does not circle the globe nor transport parties varying in size from three or four to sixty persons for nothing." In Hamilton, Ontario, one man gave a personal check for \$5,000. Gifts are constantly brought in. The Group says that is God's way of providing for them in their work.

In public meetings there is little to suggest a religious service—no hymns, Scripture, nor general prayers. All that belongs to the church, they say. All excitement is eschewed. There is no attempt to work on the emotions—just a plain, matter-of-fact witnessing. Each speaker gives his or her message quietly, naturally, earnestly. "They simply, humbly, and joyously narrate what the Christian life means to them; and herein is their power." The one absorbing passion of the Group is to make "life-changers." Their characteristic mode of work is through the "house party" of from a week-end to two weeks, to which people come through friendly invitations, where the Bible is intensively studied daily, a "quiet time" of prayer and meditation is spent every morning, and personal approaches are made for surrendered lives. They "share" each other's experiences and accept without reservations what they believe to be the daily "guidance" of the Holy Spirit.

"Guidance" is one of the strong features of the work. Mr. A. J. Russell in his book *For Sinners Only* describes "visions and flashes of revelation" by which he has been guided. They accept with literalness that, when a man is "changed," that is, when he has received the light, when he is inclined to say, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" he will be told wherever and whenever a direction as

to his choice of duty is required in order that he may do his Lord's will. In connection with "guidance," both Russell and Shoemaker refer to "the quiet hour." That phrase applies to a period of time which is devoted to a sort of mental introspection. It may be an hour daily devoted to "listening in on God," to quote Russell's rather irreverent term for it, or it may refer to the pause when some problem has arisen. Each individual regularly practises this "withdrawal" for guidance, and those associated in a project also use it. When persons are engaged in this pursuit of the divine will, they provide themselves with a pencil and paper, on which they write down the thoughts that occur to them. Sooner or later a course of action is chosen, and the decision reached is accepted as "His will" in the situation. Guidance is ascribed to the Holy Spirit.

Shoemaker comments: "There are of course conditions of guidance." First there must be a surrendered will, then relaxation from tension, absence from self-consciousness, consciousness of faith (a leaning toward God), a regular time for waiting on Him, and active obedience. Under proper conditions, "guidance comes with an authority all its own," but with varied intensity. It is "sometimes the motion of a consecrated human mind mobilized to do the will of God and sometimes the clear shooting-in of God's thought above our thought, transcending human thought supernaturally."

"Guidance must be tested by the Spirit of Christ. . . . Guidance if true will never be found contrary to the New Testament." Circumstances sometimes make God's will clear. "But chiefly guidance must be tested by the concurrence of other guided people." Relations to the divine will, Shoemaker declares, do not resemble a line of communication between two beings, God and myself, but a triangle, God, myself, and another who depends on guidance. This prescription presents a difficulty in that the number of folk who are able to interpret and practise guidance is still small; therefore "you may have gradually to raise up your own group."

"Do the members of the Group smoke or drink?" "If God guides them to," was the answer of Mr. Holme when asked this question at Toronto. "Under that rule, do any of them smoke or drink?" "Yes, some of them," said Mr. Holme. "God guides us, and I personally have never found that He denied me anything that was necessary to me so that I could carry on His work. We get our guidance in silent times, and we travel in perfect harmony. If that isn't unity in Christ, what is? It is just a matter of whether you guide your life or let God do it," he added. "Have you ever had an experience in Christ? Have you ever listened to His messages? What is your ambition, and what do you want to do with your life? If you would only have a quiet half-hour in the morning and listen to the voice of God, you would get guidance, too, and you would become a leader

of our Group," he said. "You could begin to change lives then and would know the real meaning of life. You would get a different look, and when you went down to the office, every one would notice it. They would want to know what had changed you. You would probably say at the beginning, 'Oh, I have a cold,' or something like that. What you should say, and what you would learn to say, is, 'I have given my life to Jesus Christ.'"

The other prominent factor in Buchmanism is "sharing," the term used for confession of sin. Starbuck gives it a somewhat wider meaning when he calls it the public or private relation of personal experience. "Sometimes it is one's guidance that is shared, sometimes a problem or a temptation, sometimes a defeat or a victory, often it is a defeat which has been followed by victory through Christ. Sometimes it is for the benefit of the sharer and sometimes for the help of the person with whom one shares. Of course, it frequently involves confession of sin." It generally means that in the literature of the cult—the exchange of experiences in sinning and in gaining relief from sinning between one who has been "changed" and one who has not. In reports of this process some years ago, the term "confession" was used. The verse from St. James's epistle, chap. 5, 16, is the Scriptural authority cited by Samuel Shoemaker for this practise: "Confess your sins one to another and pray for one another that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." Russell, describing a meeting of Oxford students, writes: "Young men were revealing their real selves, though saying nothing that offended good taste. Modesty, but no false reserve. Young aristocrats of Oxford were showing a masked world how to be honest by removing their own masks. They told of their daily fight with sin, indicated some of their sins: pride, selfishness, dishonesty, laziness, impurity, admitted their slips, and showed how, through the indwelling presence of the living Christ, they were achieving victory."

When Buchmanism first came to Princeton University, some ten years ago, reports were abroad implicating the sexual relations of the men in these private confession groups. These reports have not been revived during the present campaign, but critics of the movement have expressed doubts regarding the wisdom of permitting the "sharing" of experiences or lapses in the sexual field. One of the defenders, Starbuck, has said: "If there be any special emphasis on the sins of sex, it has not come to my notice." Although the *Presbyterian* of February 16, 1933, reports a "broadside" from the wife of a clergyman in Canada which pictured the house parties as "pretty bad gatherings for any one to attend," it seems that these objectionable features have been somewhat modified. It does not seem as if "sex confessions" are now a prominent feature of "sharing."

The third characteristic is the Group. Those who accept the principles of Buchmanism form a fellowship locally, sometimes limited to the congregation, at other times, more frequently, without any regard to congregational or denominational lines.

Fairness demands that we permit one of the spokesmen of the movement to speak for himself. We have read *The Conversion of the Church*, by Samuel M. Shoemaker, rector of Calvary Church (Episcopal) in New York. The book was published by Revell last year.

Shoemaker's first chapter is entitled "Sins of the Church." The unbiased reader must agree with much that he says. His thesis is that the Church has forsaken the great function of "the cure of souls," so that this has fallen either in disuse or into other hands, while the Church is busy with other things. He stands appalled at the amount of effort which goes into "investigations." "Anybody in religious work to-day is pestered with huge forms which he is requested to fill out and file in somebody's office. All this neat tabulation may be part of a diagnosis, but it can hardly be mentioned as a cure. The same thing is done with reference to religion in colleges." A similar amount of energy is expended in the huge number of organizations which the Church must support and keep functioning. Again we will all agree. Next: "The Christian Church has gone off the rails by the espousal of what is called the social gospel, as if this were something new and something different from the whole Christian Gospel of the ages." Another great mistake is made when people think they could set religion forward by mere intellectual defense of it. "The tragic thing is that a person can be intellectually persuaded of the truth of Christianity without knowing its power in all the recesses of his life." But the chief sin of the Church of our time Shoemaker finds in its habit of "using people at the expense of developing them." It takes people where they are, lets them work for the Church in various lines of effort, but cares not at all whether Christian characters are developed. "Here is a man of wealth. He will not come often to church, but he thinks churches are good things in communities and gladly gives five hundred a year. What does that do to us in relation to him? Does it tie our tongues? Does it muzzle us? Might it not challenge him to say that God wants 'not yours, but you' and to refuse his money? . . . How many well-to-do men sit on church, charity, Young Men's Christian Association, and mission boards, dry, sterile, spiritually inert, because the executive secretaries and other board members take them for granted, are willing to accept their judgment and their cash, to use them at the expense of developing them?"

Underlying all this is the stressing of activity rather than the development of the Christian. The great word has become "service."

We give money, we provide hospital care, we help people over difficulties, we show much human kindness; but "when we look a little below the surface, we find that these remedies are painfully temporary and almost never touch aught but the surface of the problem. . . . They are poultices on cancers, rose-water squirted at leprosy. . . . Modern America is all but gone insane with the notion that religion consists solely in this service. . . . And the fruit of these things is all about us. The effect upon the ministers is one of profound bewilderment and discouragement. These directions in which the churches seem tending call for a combination of qualities few men can hope to possess, namely, those of an orator, an organizer, a social reformer, an economist, a business man, a philosopher, and a Rotarian. . . . And the effect upon the layman is slow secularization, paganization. It has become appalling what our ministers are content with in their people!" Yet there is "a stirring and restlessness among many of our laymen who demanded a deeper experience of religion." This demand is satisfied by the Oxford Group Movement.

The lack of any reference to doctrine is notable in this chapter. Not only that, it is significant of the entire movement. The author has no complaint regarding the weakening of doctrinal foundations which has become so startlingly apparent in the American churches. Among the sins of the churches he does not list the rejection of verbal inspiration, their departure from the historic creeds in such articles as the deity of Christ, the atonement, sin, grace, justification. He finds fault with what we regard as the substitute for emphasis on doctrine, not with the loss of that emphasis. But let us proceed.

The author has now demonstrated "how certain modern trends in religion have petered out and how religion has been betrayed by some of its own backers." (P. 65.) "The trouble with the Church is not want of equipment, money, programs, or paraphernalia; it is want of personal experience of Jesus Christ and genuine faith on the part of her ministers and people." (P. 35.) Possibly one must be an initiate to know what the author means by "experience of Jesus Christ," identified by him with "conversion"; but be it said that on this crucial point the book gives us no information. He seems to identify conversion with sanctification when he pleads "that our lives be dedicated to God's will in utter surrender and consecration." (P. 29.) Quite immaterial is the "ecclesiastical point of view," by which he means the doctrines of the respective churches. Some, he says, mistakenly think that they are converted "because they have clung to an orthodox theory of the atonement." (P. 33.) Now, to get a start with conversion, our first step is made "by the sharing of these sins with another Christian who has found his way a bit farther than we have" (p. 35), when "some one else carries with us in sympathetic understanding the secret which lay like lead in our hearts." (P. 37.)

The next step will be addressing ourselves to God in prayer, especially with "the prayer which seeks to find, rather than to change, His will. This means that listening-prayer is much more important than asking-prayer." (P. 41.) In this way we get "a real hold on God and a real knowledge of His will by genuine revelation." (P. 63.) Examples of guidance: "A distinguished clergyman was preaching a series of sermons as a guest preacher and had clear guidance to leave the last one unprepared and trust God for His message at the last minute. The preacher obeyed His guidance and is convinced that God gave him a greater message than he could have prepared." (P. 53.) A woman "had guidance to return a certain dress she had bought. . . . A man was guided one day to stop at a gas station, when he needed neither gas, oil, nor water." (P. 56.) The minister will "write letters on guidance, preach sermons on guidance, deal with his session or vestry on guidance, make his personal plans on guidance." (P. 58.) The practise is carried into the Sunday-school, where the little ones have a "quiet hour" and all the children "wait on God." They find that "God speaks to them very clearly." (P. 112.) "How different it is when the church-school is based not only on teaching, but on religious experience, when the classes begin with a 'quiet time,' the children share their real problems and needs, get God's direction, work out their lives on the basis of an experience of God!" (P. 71.)

The points of contact for this Group movement are preferably the men's club, now addressed by some lecturer while the men "sit fish-eyed and lifeless on the benches and wait for the coffee" (p. 90); the ministerial conference, now too often concerned with deliberately controversial questions, denominational doctrines, regarding these as a basis for fellowship. Shoemaker has little patience with this attitude. "I find spiritual fellowship with surrendered, guided people in so many various camps that I seldom wish to obtrude a point of view which may be only divisive." (P. 92.) The prospect is that such "groups" increase all over the world, and the great goal is Christian unity. Even now Shoemaker rejoices in the news that an Anglo-Catholic bishop in Africa laid his hands in blessing upon the head of a Boer of the Dutch Reformed Church as he took his way to America to attend a Presbyterian seminary. (P. 121.)

Our attitude toward Buchmanism, what shall it be?

As a criticism of a mechanical, institutional Christianity it addresses itself to a real need. Its emphasis on personal Christianity, on working with individual souls, is a rebuke to the social gospel and, in fact, to the modernistic conception of church-work. When this has been said, all that is really commendable about Buchmanism has been mentioned. There is in this movement no clear-cut statement of the deity of Christ and His atonement on the cross. It ac-

cepts upon equal terms into its fellowship those who believe in Jesus as the Son of God and the Savior of the world and those who regard Him as the matchless teacher and dauntless martyr. The Church cannot accept such a compromise. A Presbyterian critic has aptly said: "Christianity is based upon certain doctrines of God, Christ, sin, and salvation. Any movement that offers to lead the Church to new victories must be judged by its open and unswerving loyalty to these doctrines as they are revealed in the Bible. Acceptance of Christ is not enough. What Christ do you receive? The Christ of the New Testament or Jesus the teacher from Nazareth?" Its doctrinal indifference is our chief objection to the Oxford Group. As for the "sharing," James 5 does not contain the basis which is sought. The text speaks of the sick and their treatment. And while the Scriptures certainly demand of us that we confess to the brother the sins we have committed against him, it gives no such directions as are involved in the practise of "sharing." The practise is nothing new. It was one of the methods employed in the protracted meetings which were common in the eighties and in earlier decades in the United States.

The practise of seeking "guidance," "direct revelations," from the Holy Spirit regarding matters of belief, attitude, or conduct sets aside the cardinal principle of the sole authority and sufficiency of the written Word of God. "Listening in on God," where God has given no promise of immediate communication, is spiritual presumption and is the very essence of Reformed fanaticism (*Schwärmerei*). It builds Christian assurance, both as to matters of faith and of life, upon the quicksand of human emotion and is as far a departure from sound Biblical Christianity as rationalism. The uniqueness of Old and New Testament revelation is destroyed. No longer is the Word of the prophets and apostles our sole guide and authority in religious matters, but the inner voice, or urge, or impulse, which comes in the "quiet hour."

The *Christian Advocate* (Methodist) in its issue of February 9 contains the following keen criticism: "Some of the points at which the movement needs to be more closely studied are these: What does it mean by the forgiveness of sin? How nearly is its insistence on 'sharing'—that is, confession of sin—a thing for general application? and, What weakness or dangers are to be avoided in its practise of 'guidance'—that is, the direct illumination of the mind by the Holy Spirit? . . . Confession has its great values, but it has long-recognized limitations and dangers, which the Oxford 'groups' do not seem to take into account. And the daily, almost hourly, dependence on a direct word from God concerning such every-day choices of life as have little or no moral significance seems to cut under the truth that God has given us the spirit of love and of power

and of a sound mind. For what, if not to develop spiritual self-control? In point of fact, the doctrine of 'guidance' has greater meaning and dignity when we accept our God-given responsibility for the day's work than when we find it necessary to ask for instructions at every turn."

One critic, quoted in the *Lutheran*, lists six "harmful features": 1) Centering the thought on sin; 2) inculcating morbid introspection; 3) overemphasis of sex problems; 4) insistence on listening for divine "guidance"; 5) substituting for intelligence emotional subconscious urging in relationship with our environment; 6) a warping of the personality of the individual. He thinks the Group disparages by implication the entire Christian ministry.

The universal acclaim which the movement has received in the United States and Canada is a token that the modernistic phase of church-life has lost its appeal. In a way it is a parallel to the Theology of Crisis,²⁾ which has come as a rebound from the theology of the higher criticism. In both cases the cure may turn out to be as bad as the disease.

THEODORE GRAEBNER.

What is Meant by "All Fulness," Col. 1, 19?

The verse in question reads in the original: "Ου ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι. The Authorized Version translates: "For it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell," while the Revised Version renders it: "For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fulness dwell." The Vulgate (Nestle, 5): "Quia in ipso complacuit, omnem plenitudinem inhabitare." Luther: "Denn es ist das Wohlgefallen gewesen, dass in ihm alle Fuelle wohnen sollte." Moffatt modernizes: "For it was in Him that the divine Fulness willed to settle without limit."

Whom has "it pleased"? This is not expressly stated in this verse if one translates as does the Authorized Version, the Revised Version, the Vulgate, and Luther. Moffatt answers: "The Fulness." Four different answers have been given by various exegetes. Some supply "Father," others "the Son" or "Christ," still others "God," and some finally take πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα as the subject with Moffatt. Accepting the second view, one would be forced to interpret καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι of v. 20 as meaning that it pleased the Son, or Christ, to reconcile through the fulness. That would be strange, to say the least, in the light of 2 Cor. 5, 18, according to which God reconciles through Christ. To supply "God" or "the Father" may

2) Dr. Brunner, the famous expounder of Barth, has accepted the Buchman movement.